



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

of the matter, an arrangement admirably adapted for the use of serious students of the subject, for whom after all the book was written. The repetition is as little to be deprecated as would be the repetition in a particularly good index; it is the result of thoroughness of treatment.

The book will not only be a source of information to students of mediaeval religious drama, but should contribute fundamentally to the history of folk-thought. It is sure to stimulate further investigation in the allied English field, and the points of contact and difference, when fully determined in all their bearings, will, quite aside from their technical interest, supply data of a trustworthy kind for a curious chapter in the study of comparative folk-psychology.

FLORENCE GERTRUDE JENNEY.

Vassar College.

SHAKSPERIAN STUDIES. By Members of the Department of English and Comparative Literature in Columbia University. Edited by Brander Matthews and Ashley Horace Thorndike. New York. Columbia University Press. 1916. 8vo, pp. x, 452. Price, \$2.25 net.

SHAKESPEARE STUDIES. By Members of the Department of English of the University of Wisconsin. Madison. Published by the University. 1916. 8vo, pp. 300.

AMERICAN EDITIONS OF SHAKESPEARE, 1753-1866. By Jane Sherzer. In *Publications of the Modern Language Association*, December, 1907, xxii. (n.s. xv.) 633-96. Cambridge, Mass.

HAMLET, AN IDEAL PRINCE, AND OTHER ESSAYS IN SHAKESPEAREAN INTERPRETATION. By Alexander W. Crawford. Boston. Richard G. Badger. 1916. Small 8vo, pp. 317. Price, \$1.50 net.

SHAKESPEARE IN AMERICA. By William B. Cairns. In *Edda: Nordisk Tidsskrift for Litteraturforskning*, Heft 3, 1916, vi. 189-208. Kristiania. W. Nygaard.

Not the least important part of the celebration of the Shakespeare tercentenary was the two handsome volumes of studies published by members of the Departments of English in Columbia University and the University of Wisconsin. It is perhaps worth noting that each institution is a prominent and representative one in its respective territory, the one being typical of the great endowed universities of the East, in which old-fashioned ideas of culture still prevail, the other representing the energetic and progressive state universities of the West, in which, it is generally supposed, there is a strong tendency toward supporting especially

those studies which make for practical material improvement and advancement. That institutions of both these types recognize the value of Shakespeare's works as a means to culture speaks well for the common ideals of American education.

Typographically, both volumes are somewhat disappointing. The Columbia volume is marred by more misprints than we generally expect to find nowadays.¹ The name Shakspeare is variously divided into syllables (cf. pp. 67, l. 3 f.b., 243, end). The plan followed in the fourth and thirteenth papers, of putting a reference in parenthesis outside of the sentence without capital or period (see, for example, p. 81, ll. 18, 22, p. 84, l. 3, p. 321, l. 15 f.b.), has no warrant in the usage of any reputable printing office with which we are acquainted; the proof-reader himself has been inconsistent (cf. p. 85, l. 1 f.b., p. 88, l. 18). The correct usage is followed on p. 70, ll. 7, 14, 25, 37. In the Wisconsin volume an unfortunate choice of type has disfigured several pages (e.g., pp. 207-11, the titles of the plays should have been, say, in small capitals roman).²

That opinion is still divided as to the best spelling of Shakespeare's name is illustrated by the fact that in the Wisconsin volume the customary spelling Shakespeare, now practically universal, is followed, while the Columbia scholars have uniformly spelled it Shakspeare. Obviously, however, they go too far when they change the spelling in quoted passages or titles. One exception (p. 431, n. 1) seems to have got by.

In quality, the papers in both volumes are in the main sound and worthy contributions to the study of Shakespeare and the Elizabethan drama.

The Columbia volume³ includes eighteen papers, of which eleven are general, while seven have to do with individual plays or characters. Prefixed is a graceful sonnet, Shakspeare Dead, by Professor J. B. Fletcher.

¹ P. 18, l. 19, p. 19, l. 13 f.b., p. 20, l. 1 f.b., read plebeians. P. 20, l. 10 f.b., read foreseen. P. 22, l. 9 f.b., no paragraph. P. 26, l. 1 f.b., read Publications. P. 204, l. 17, delete the first word. P. 111, l. 7 f.b., read these data. P. 299, l. 8, read villainist; l. 14, read quintessence. P. 307, l. 9 f.b., read resource. P. 315, l. 2 f.b., the expression "as edited" is most unusual; is there a printer's error here? P. 317, end, an omission. P. 382, l. 8, read the ones. P. 450, n. 3, read *Reliquiae Antiquae*.

² P. 99, l. 12 f.b., the preferable spelling is Antony. P. 128, l. 8 f.b., read needs. Pp. 128, l. 3 f.b., 276, l. 8, and perhaps elsewhere, the name is wrongly divided at the end of the line. P. 131, l. 6 f.b., comma after IV. P. 191, l. 11 f.b., bad spacing. P. 263, l. 18, p. 272, l. 4, and elsewhere, the period would look better inside the quotation marks (as in l. 10). P. 281, l. 15, read belong. On pp. 77, 101, 123, 145, 199, 213, 229, 251, and 275 the headlines are wrong.

³ The following reviews have already appeared: *The Athenæum*, Dec., 1916, p. 595; *The Boston Transcript*, May 10, 1916, p. 5; *The Catholic World*, Nov., 1916, civ. 261; *The Nation*, July 13, 1916, ciii. 40; *The New York Times Review of Books*, May 21, 1916, xxi. 212; *The Spectator*, Dec. 23, 1916, cxvii. 808; *The Columbia University Quarterly*, Sept., 1916, xviii. 373-6, by R. M. Alden; *The American Journal of Philology*, Jan.-March, 1917, xxxviii. 93-6, by T. S. Graves; *Modern Philology*, Jan., 1918, xv. 189-91, by C. R. Baskerville.

In the opening essay Professor Brander Matthews discusses Shaksperian Stage Traditions. He insists upon the importance of preserving for the general good the immense body of traditions of how great actors have interpreted Shakespeare's lines, and urges that future editors of the plays shall utilize these traditions. Too often great passages, e.g., Portia's plea for mercy, are merely declaimed without reference to the setting, or the needs of the moment, or the obvious intent of the dramatist. On the other hand, whatever the dramatist may have intended to do, it is important to note what he actually did. On this ground Professor Matthews boldly justifies Irving's and Booth's Shylock, while admitting it to be "highly probable that Shakspeare intended Shylock to be a despicable villain detestable to all spectators." This goes squarely against the doctrine expounded by Prof. Crawford (see below) that what Shakespeare meant to do should be good enough for anybody; the reader may take his choice.

Professor Thorndike's paper on Shakspeare as a Debtor is a temperate and well considered statement of the kinds of debts that Shakespeare owed to his contemporaries and his times. Certainly the extent of his known indebtedness has increased as the years have piled up their records of scholarly gleanings in Elizabethan dramatic history.⁴ Yet after it has all been rehearsed, Shakespeare remains supreme. His supremacy, however, is now seen to be of a different sort from that which Dowden, for example, imagined to be his. The formula used to be, Shakespeare first, the rest nowhere. But now we have to admit that the contemporary dramatists were a very busy and by no means negligible group. "During the period of Shakspeare's authorship, London probably often saw one hundred new plays in a single year." Yet among the playwrights of the day, Shakespeare is still easily first, for whatever he touched he improved and transformed. "Amid the rivalry of the brilliant group which gives primacy in English literature to the first decade of the seventeenth century, he maintained his leadership whether on the public stage, at court, or in the Mermaid tavern." And on the whole we think the public is coming round to the view so long championed by Professor Thorndike, that Shakespeare's changes in method and detail are to be attributed not so much "to the effects of his personal experience, resulting in periods of depression and exaltation," as to "the changes and movement of the drama of his time." Some further light is thrown on this subject by Professor Frank A. Patterson, who writes on Shakspeare and the Medieval Lyric. He has found in the plays many traces of medieval songs, and concludes that Shakespeare, perhaps more than his contemporaries, modeled his lyrics on those of former times. As a lyrist he "took

⁴ For an example of the latest of these, see Miss Janet Spens's Essay on Shakespeare's Relation to Tradition, and the present writer's review of it in *The Dial*, Sept. 13, 1917, lxiii. 216.

the poetry that England had bequeathed him and made of it songs not unlike those of his predecessors, yet unapproached."

Such doctrine as is embodied in these two papers means that many books like Dowden's will have to be scrapped, and that Shakespeare's spiritual history will have to be rewritten. But to what extent can it be ascertained? How much can we safely infer from the internal evidence of the plays and poems? This is the ever fresh theme of Professor William T. Brewster's paper on Shakspeare's Personality. It is iconoclastic in a high degree. The author contends that all the attempts yet made to reconstruct the personality of the poet have been vain and futile, and that such efforts can never be anything else. We shall all agree, doubtless, that it is not safe to trust any reconstruction based wholly on his works. We do not yet know enough about psychology to be sure that any writer's personality can be reconstructed from his works. Still, we are much inclined to believe that there is some definite relation between personality and authorship, just as there is believed to be between personality and penmanship; and we incline further to believe that some facets of Shakespeare's personality may be safely inferred from the body of work generally attributed to him. It is like believing in immortality: you can't prove it, but you go right along believing (or disbelieving) in it according to your temperament, while admitting, of course, that it has no scientific basis. Further, when Professor Brewster says that the record and the inferences that we may legitimately make concerning Shakespeare "do not indicate a supremely interesting personality," we must pronounce this an opinion so highly subjective that debate becomes impossible. One may disagree with this view without putting Shakespeare on a false pedestal. Every one will have his own opinion. After all, what do we mean by "an interesting personality"? The quality of interest is a supremely relative matter.

Professor Charles S. Baldwin, in an interesting Note on the History Play, calls attention to the perenniality of this type of drama, and to the fact that these plays, which are still popular and are still usually written in verse, were of the sort that kindled Shakespeare's tragedy and liberated all his dramatic powers. But would not the author have been more convincing if he had drawn his illustrations from some other play than *Othello*? Surely this is not a history play in any ordinary sense—or if it be one, then the word "history" becomes synonymous with its congener "story" and all tragedies become history plays. True, "in a large sense we may speak of Elizabethan tragedy as representing history in poetry, and of the historical conception of drama as idealizing human passions in great figures of the past" (p. 303); but is not this rather confusing than enlightening? The Elizabethan history plays were concerned with the great deeds of the English kings and derived their interest from this fact. Certainly no Eliza-

bethan thought of the Italians among whom Othello's lot was cast as having anything to do with his own forefathers (cf. the quotation from Sir Thomas Browne, p. 310). We may readily admit Lear and Macbeth into the group of histories, because they belong to British history; yet even here it may fairly be doubted if the spectator thought as much about the history as he did about the story. In his main contention, however, Professor Baldwin is undoubtedly right.

Professor Franklin T. Baker, writing on Shakspeare in the Schools, points out how the changing phases of our study of Shakespeare reflect our progress in ideas. Seventy years ago, when we knew little about and cared less for the theater, school-books included merely selections and detached passages. Then, with the editions of Hudson and Rolfe, came the interest in the psychology and especially in the ethical aspirations of Shakespeare, to be succeeded by interest in the dramaturgy of the poet. We wish Professor Baker had expressed himself more at length about how Shakespeare should *not* be taught in the schools; doubtless lack of space prevented him from handling this large subject. As it is, the paper is decidedly interesting. In connection with the increasing number of school performances of the plays, of which Professor Baker speaks, Professor Allan Abbott's paper on School Performances of Shakspeare's Plays is timely and will be found full of useful hints. Perhaps the author is inclined to cut rather over much. If the schoolboy has the right attitude toward Shakespeare, he will stand a good deal; if he has not, it is a question if mere excisions will give such an attitude.

In his *Reality and Inconsistency in Shakspeare's Characters*, Professor Ernest H. Wright makes some good points. Of all English poets and perhaps of all poets, Shakespeare is the least likely to get between his characters and his readers. These characters are, in consequence, more true to life in the sense that they give us more of the complexity of real life than do the characters of an artist like Racine, whose characters are relatively simple, logical, and consistent. These statements are elaborately illustrated by an analysis of Hamlet, after which the author gives some illustrations of how, in consequence, (1) Shakespeare characters have been treated as independent creatures of flesh and blood; (2) how critics have been tempted to seek the hidden Shakespeare in the characters themselves; and (3) how opinions with reference to these characters clash. In these last paragraphs Professor Wright shows effectively the futility of much of the so-called Shakespeare criticism of the last few years.

Professor Carl Van Doren has sought to find out what Shakespeare has to say about the art of the poet and the dramatist. The results are meager. In speaking about poets, Shakespeare takes about the same tone "as a reserved and humorous poet might use with regard to his profession in the easy gossip of a club." Of

the dramatic art he says little. "He could discuss, penetratingly and finally, the technic of an art, as 'Hamlet' shows; but he kept his own artistic principles implicit in his art."

Professor Harrison R. Steeves undertakes an evaluation of certain American editors of Shakespeare. His work is independent of that of Miss Sherzer, which he did not see till his labors were practically completed, and the two papers, both of which are valuable, well supplement each other. Miss Sherzer, who has much more space at her disposal, begins with Mrs. Lennox's *Shakespeare Illustrated* (1753), although that is properly not an edition at all but merely a recapitulation of the stories on which the plays were founded, and concludes her list with Richard Grant White. She mentions all the editions of which she has knowledge, and quotes the title pages, carefully indicating by means of an asterisk those editions she has not personally seen. By means of judicious quotations she indicates each editor's point of view and makes fairly clear his actual contribution to the higher and lower criticism of the poet. Professor Steeves is not so much concerned with dates (he does not even tell us when the first American edition was published) or bibliographical details as with the qualities and the achievement of each successive editor whom he discusses. He brings his study down to the present time. It is interesting to compare some of the remarks of the two critics. Of the Boston edition of 1836 Miss Sherzer says: "This edition, rather than Richard Grant White's of twenty years later, deserves to be called epoch-making, for the publishers claim to follow, in general, the readings of the folio of 1623." Professor Steeves says: "Peabody's edition is plainly not of high importance, as it involved nothing more than the working over of material then very much esteemed." Again, Miss Sherzer says that Hudson⁵ began in 1844 to write lectures on Shakespeare; Steeves says that he produced a series of lectures which he delivered in the South and Middle West in 1843. We are unable to pronounce definitely which is right, but from such evidence as we have been able to collect, it would seem that Steeves's statement is a safe one. The late Andrew J. George, who knew Hudson intimately, in his edition of Hudson's *Essays on English Studies*, says: "On graduating from college in 1840 he went to Kentucky, where he began teaching. The next two years [presumably 1841-3] he taught in Huntsville, Alabama. He continued his Shakespearean studies meanwhile and gathered material for a series of lectures which he gave to large audiences in the principal southern cities. . . . In 1844 he came to Boston." Connected with this point is the story mentioned by Miss Sherzer that Hudson was induced at the age of thirty to begin the reading of Shakespeare. This story is related in Appleton's *Cyclopædia of American Biography*, 1888 (iii. 298),

⁵ By a misprint (p. 670, l. 12) Miss Sherzer makes Hudson a student at Middleton instead of Middlebury College.

in such a way as to make it appear that Hudson himself told the story. The contradictory fact mentioned by Miss Sherzer is not seriously damaging to the authenticity of the tale, since Hudson might easily make such an off-hand remark without implying anything of consequence; but there is evidence, if George (pp. xiii-xv) is to be credited, that Shakespeare was among the earliest books he read and that he wrote essays on Shakespeare while in college.⁶

The Question of Shakspeare's Pronunciation is discussed by Professor Harry M. Ayres. Though he does not settle the question, he offers some valuable hints. The vocabulary of the phonetician is always a puzzling problem; it is doubtful if Professor Ayres has made himself wholly clear by the use of such terms as "obscure vowel" (p. 243, l. 16 f.b.) and "retracted or inverted" (p. 250, l. 15 f.b.); but in the main a layman will be able to read him with ease. Was the *l* ever sounded in *could* (p. 241, l. 14 f.b.)? The argument *a priori* is, of course, against it. The *NED*. (ii. 57) says: "*l* began to be inserted about 1525, apparently in mechanical imitation of *should* and *would*, where an etymological *l* had become silent so that these words now rimed with *coud*." Lounsbury (*HEL.*, 2d ed., p. 458) and Emerson (*BrHEL.*, p. 133) both say categorically that it was never pronounced. On the other hand Vietor (*Shakespeare's Pronun.* i. 96) says, "Various orthoepists testify also to the [l] in *could* and *would*." According to Ellis (*EEPr.* iii. 886, col. 1, iv. 1005, col. 2) the pronunciation of *l* was indicated by Smith, 1568, Bullokar, 1580, Gill, *Logonomia*, 2d ed., 1621, Butler, 1633, Price, 1668, and Cooper, 1685 (the last gives *could* possem and *cool'd* refrigeratus as homonyms). Richard Grant White believed it was sounded, and in a note to *LLL*. v. 1. 5 says that *l* in *could*, *would* was heard in the old pronunciation of the eastern U. S. Hart, in his *Orthography* (1569, quoted by Jespersen, *MnEGr.* i. 294), has *kuld*, *shuld*, (*w*)*uld*. Spenser repeatedly rhymed *would*, *could*, *should* (Ellis, *EEPr.* iii. 871, col. 2); and Shakespeare rhymed *should* and *cool'd* (*VA.* 385). In spite of this evidence, however, we cannot bring ourselves to believe that the *l* in *could* was universally pronounced (it may have been sporadically) in Shakespeare's time. At that time the reading public was not large, and the spelling had not begun to influence the pronunciation as it has since done in many words. Ellis himself differentiates between (*shuuld*) (*EEPr.* iii. 986, l. 23, 993,

⁶ Cf., too, the incident related by Rev. Luther H. Sheldon, of the class of 1839 at Middlebury College: "At one time when Hudson seemed even more than usually earnest and happy in his comments, I remarked to him, 'Hudson, you will some day write a book on Shakespeare; I will give you a title,—The Beauties of the World's Greatest Poet.' He replied, 'Oh, no; I read and study this author only because of the genuine pleasure it affords me, and the kind of rest it gives me from the fatigue and routine of my college application.' " Quoted in *The Place in Letters of Henry Norman Hudson*, published by Middlebury College, Feb., 1916, p. 5.

l. 19) (shuu'dst) (995, ll. 23, 24), (shuld) (989, l. 6), (wuuld) (989, l. 18, 991, l. 26), and (wud) (988, l. 9 f.b.) and (kud) (992, l. 6).

We come now to the studies of individual plays and characters; these, lack of space forbids us to do more than mention. Professor George C. D. Odell, in one of the most entertaining of all the papers, describes the revivals of *A Midsummer Night's Dream* on the New York stage. When he calls the 1826 performance "the first performance of a Shaksperian play in America" (p. 122), surely this is a slip of the pen. Does he not mean *a* first performance? An ambiguous sentence like this is quite unusual in so careful a writer. Professor William W. Lawrence, dealing with *The Love Story* in 'Troilus and Cressida,' makes it clear that Shakespeare was simply maintaining the traditional views of these characters, and that because of the rise of modern ethical ideals of the relations of the sexes, the old heroes and heroines of the stories based on the medieval code of courtly love were bound to suffer. Professor John Erskine shows how by a few simplifying changes Shakespeare adapted the current story of *Romeo and Juliet* to the immortal expression of the tragedy of young love. Professor Algernon D. Tassin studies *Julius Caesar*. He finds Shakespeare's debt to Plutarch very great; yet Shakespeare departs from Plutarch in his conception of Brutus, to whom he believed Plutarch too partial, and in many minor details he alters and adds in such a way as to achieve "the dramatization of his audience." Besides, *Julius Caesar* is both lucid in diction and void of dead wood. "It is his only tragedy of which you can say there is nothing too much of anything. It is his only tragedy, almost his only play, of which the original version and the present acting-version can be the same." Possibly a more skilful handling of the mass of details which Professor Tassin gives us would have made parts of his essay easier reading. Professor Trent contributes some useful textual notes on *Pericles*. Professor Krapp finds in *Parolles* not a kind of Falstaff but a reflection of the Elizabethan "villainist and modernist time-servers who walked the streets of London in gaudy splendor." The moral of his character is that "style is not enough to procure the salvation of a man." Finally, Professor Cunliffe, in discussing *The Character of Henry V as Prince and King*, lays down the general principle that provided our imagination does not "run counter to Shakspeare's conception and thus create inconsistencies which are not to be found in the text," we moderns have a right to modern conceptions of Shakespeare's characters—"the one great question for us is the impression they make on our minds as we see them across the footlights or imagine them rising from the printed page." He then illustrates this by pointing out how Henry V, once the mirror

⁷ See the much more detailed account of the matter in Hyder E. Rollins's paper on *The Troilus-Cressida Story from Chaucer to Shakespeare* in *PMLA*., Sept., 1917, xxxii. 383-429.

of all Christian kings, is now (though Masefield goes too far in condemnation) to be regarded rather as a very human but efficient ruler, energetic, ambitious, scheming, unscrupulous, full of religiosity like the Kaiser, for his time not indelicate, "masterful, downright, bluff, good-natured. . . . It is his common humanity that endears him to us, his high courage, his modesty, his plain-speaking, his good-humor, and his practical common-sense."

The Wisconsin volume⁸ includes thirteen items, of which the first is a series of eight sonnets by Professor William Ellery Leonard; of these we like the sixth best. In this book, in contrast with the Columbia volume, three papers are not immediately concerned with Shakespeare. Of the nine remaining all but one are general.

We will begin with Professor J. F. A. Pyre's paper on Shakespeare's Pathos. The author is not very successful, we think, in characterizing pathos. He is right, to be sure, and he should have put it more strongly, when he says that "it is doubtful . . . if beauty or joy are ever truly pathetic save through some (however delicate) *arrière pensée* of their transiency, helplessness, insecurity, or the like; as of 'beauty whose action is no stronger than a flower,' and 'joy whose hand is ever at his lips, bidding adieu.' " But here he should have stopped, instead of going on to say that "Pathos may arise from a sense of contrast between present joy and foregone hardship, suffering, or peril." Pathos rather arises from the sense of contrast between present joy and hardship or peril soon to come. A good instance is to be found in Hawthorne's story of *The Ambitious Guest*; the ambition of the young traveler is pathetic. Further, contrast the joy of the soldier who comes home from the wars and greets his wife and children, with the feelings of the same soldier who bids his family farewell to go back to almost certain death on the battlefield, or with the parting of Hector and Andromache. In the one case, there is only pure joy; in the other there is certainly pathos. Again, the author further confuses us by what he says of sleep: "Sleep is one of the natural goods of life, beautiful in itself, like flowers, like the songs of birds. It is the touchstone of health; as the man sleepeth, so is he. Where virtue is, it is more virtuous, and where beauty is, more beautiful. The relation to sleep therefore becomes an index of character and of psychic constitution and a means of portraying them. Such intimate revelations are pathetic." There is nothing pathetic, however, about the sleep of a healthy person free from care; indeed, it is doubtful if there is anything pathetic about sleep except as it suggests death. Macbeth, thinking of his murdered king, exclaims,

After life's fitful fever he sleeps well.

Where is the pathos? In the sleep there is certainly none; perhaps there is in the thought of the living who must suffer so much

⁸ Already reviewed in *The Nation*, Oct. 12, 1916, ciii. 357.

before they are privileged to sleep too; but here we pass quickly from pathos to pity. It is curious that the author himself is not something more than suspicious of the propriety of citing the sleep of Falstaff at the Boar's Head (pp. 57 f.) as an instance of pathos. Nor do we always like Professor Pyre's vocabulary. The use of *wooingest* (p. 54, l. 2 f.b.) and *livingness* (p. 55, l. 8 f.b.) will tend to alienate certain sober readers. And what does he mean by the passive verb in this sentence: "The matter which is vital to this discussion, however, is not the loss of our sympathies, but the means by which they are sought to be regained"?

This is followed by John Robert Moore's paper on The Function of the Songs in Shakespeare's Plays. He finds that "Shakespeare was virtually the first Elizabethan dramatist to make systematic employment of the song for dramatic purposes; that he used either blank, fragmentary, or complete songs in all of the plays but nine, of which several are, at least in part, by other hands; that his songs are inseparable from the context . . . ; that they serve not for the gross humor of boisterous clownage or of raving madness, but for the subtle and delightful portrayal of human nature, the enrichment of scene or atmosphere, the expression of thought or mood inappropriate for the speeches, the motivation of action,⁹ the heightening of emotional effect, and the foreshadowing of what is to come."

Professor Thomas H. Dickinson, writing on Some Principles of Shakespeare Staging, points out that the Shakespearean stage, from the point of view of rapport, was chiefly flexible rather than bare; this quality "forced him back to the use of his strongest medium of expression, the only medium that withstands all the tests and changes of time, the medium of the idea expressed in perfect language." The modern stage is pictorial rather than plastic or flexible. It tends (1) to separate the regions of reality and imagination; (2) to limit the instrumentalities of the drama to the intellect and the senses; and (3) to fasten the action to a narrow space contiguous to the audience. Thus all kinds of plays except the comedies of manners and the plays of naturalism have degenerated. The writer then traces the history of some modern attempts to make the staging of Shakespeare more flexible. The paper is useful and illuminating.

Two papers are concerned mainly with Shakespeare's poems and sonnets. Professor R. E. Neil Dodge, in An Obsolete Elizabethan Mode of Rhyming, discusses such hideous rhymes as *resolútion* : *absolútion*, which occurs here and there in Elizabethan

⁹ In this connection one recalls the song in M. of V. iii. 2. 63-71. It has been pointed out by Weiss (quoted in the *Variorum*, pp. 141-2) that the substance of this gives Bassanio a broad hint. We do not remember to have seen anywhere the further comment that the very rhyme with which this song begins (*bred:head:nourished* [:*lead*]) suggests to Bassanio the proper choice. If we assume that Portia had arranged this beforehand, we must perhaps conclude that she did not propose to take any chances.

poetry, and which may have been due, as Dodge points out, to a false notion of Chaucer's practice derived from Thynne's edition. Only four instances, we rejoice to find, are recorded in Shakespeare's non-dramatic verse; since this is a Shakespearean volume, it would have been interesting to learn if Shakespeare permitted any such vile usage in the rhyming verses of his dramas. Professor Arthur Beatty, in *Shakespeare's Sonnets and Plays*, seeks for sonnet-like passages in the plays and finds "36 passages in blank verse and prose which show the sonnet structure in the way in which the thought is presented." He concludes that from 1591 to 1609 the sonnet habit was a constant in Shakespeare's mind, but that after 1609 he wrote no more sonnets. The reasoning is ingenious and convincing; but we do not see how it is made more convincing by omitting from consideration the eleven sonnets which the author also finds in the dramas.

The eighteenth century is represented by two interesting papers. Miss Lily B. Campbell, in *Garrick's Vagary*, recalls the details of the Stratford Jubilee of Sept. 6-8, 1769, by which Garrick shrewdly connected his name with that of Shakespeare. In *Joseph Ritson and Some Eighteenth Century Editors of Shakespeare*, Dr. Henry A. Burd reviews the work of one of the most picturesque of eighteenth century scholars, who in an age when scurrilous pugnacity among scholars was good form, could more than hold up his end. If Ritson had put through his edition, it would have taken high rank among the editions of a time when flourished a brilliant galaxy of commentators and editors.

With these two papers we may connect Professor Frederick W. Roe's paper on Charles Lamb and Shakespeare. His characterization of Lamb is just. Lamb possessed insight, intimacy, independence, exquisite taste, but was not broadly comprehensive. On one point, however, perhaps Roe claims too much for Lamb: namely, when he pronounces Lamb's explanation of the reason for Hamlet's assumed madness "at once the clearest and most satisfying statement of the case ever submitted." Is it necessary to say that "the terror which the sight of the ghost had left upon the senses of Hamlet, he being weak and dispirited before, almost unhinged his mind, and drove him beside his reason"? Is it not enough to remember that in the earlier forms of the story Hamlet feigns madness as a part of his plan of action?¹⁰

¹⁰ Cf. *The Hystorie of Hamblet* ii.: "The prince Hamblet perceiving himself to bee in danger of his life . . . and assuring himselfe that Fengon would not detract the time to send him the same way his father Horvendile was gone, to beguile the tyrant in his subtilties (that esteemed him to bee of such a minde that if he once attained to mans estate he wold not long delay the time to revenge the death of his father) counterfeiting the mad man with such craft and subtile practises, that hee made shewe as if hee had utterly lost his wittes; and under that vayle hee covered his pretence, and defended his life from the treasons and practises of the tyrant his uncle." The author of the *Hystorie* thought it "a great point of a wise and brave spirite in a yong prince, by so

In the one paper dealing with a single play, O. J. Campbell, Jr., deals with *A Dutch Analogue of Richard the Third*. The analogue is *De Roode en Witte Roos*, by Lambert van den Bosch, published at Amsterdam in 1651. It is in rhymed hexameters. It will be remembered that Dr. Harold Fuller, in his Providence MLA. paper in 1904, held that this play was apparently adapted from a pre-Shakespearean English play perhaps even known as *The Red and White Rose*. Mr. Campbell does not deny this, though he is very conservative about expressing himself. The most he will say is that "the Dutch play is a very definite part of the English dramatic tradition which culminated in Shakespeare." He presents here the most striking resemblances between the Dutch play and Shakespeare's.

We turn now to the non-Shakespearean papers. Professor Frank G. Hubbard, writing on *Locrine and Selimus*, elaborates evidence that *Selimus* borrowed from *Locrine*, which he finds to have been written after Aug. 8, 1591; he thinks they cannot have been by the same writer. He makes a good point in saying that parallel passages in two plays are rather evidence that two different men wrote them than that one man was the author of both. He thinks, too, that there has been all too little collection and study of passages common to several plays.¹¹ One result of such study would doubtless be that scholars would be more cautious in their attributions of plays. In *An Elizabethan Defence of the Stage*, Professor Karl Young recalls the controversy between William Gager and Dr. John Reynolds over the performance of Gager's three Latin plays at Christ Church at Shrovetide, 1592. Of the five documents in the debate, nos. 2, 3, and 5 have already been printed. Professor Young now reprints no. 1 and recapitulates no. 4 with large extracts. A point of special interest is Gager's defence of the practice of mingling comedy with tragedy. Louis Wann, in *The Collaboration of Beaumont, Fletcher, and Massinger*, gives in outline the results of investigations which seem to confirm Miss Hatcher's view (*Anglia*, Apr. 5, 1910, xxxiii. 219-31) that these three men collaborated on the basis of "a fairly definite division of subject matter. To Fletcher fell in both cases the development of the lower types of character, the production of the comic action, and the evolution of the sub-plot. Beaumont and Massinger confined themselves to the exalted characters, the serious action, and the main plot." The author's method seems to be somewhat mechanical, and until one knows in full

great a shewe of imperfection in his person for advancement, and his owne imbasing and despising, to worke the meanes and to prepare the way for himselfe to bee one of the happiest kings in his age," and cited as precedents the cases of Brutus and David (*Variorum* ii. 94 f., cf. p. 112, l. 16 f.b.). See also *Fratricide Punished* i. 6, end (*Variorum* ii. 126).

¹¹ Cf. Prof. Hubbard's valuable paper on Repetition and Parallelism in the Earlier Elizabethan Drama, *PMLA*, 1905, xx. 360-79.

the processes of reasoning employed (that is, "the data on each play," p. 158, n. 1), one must suspend judgment as to the finality of these conclusions.

With Professor Crawford's point of view,¹² we have a good deal of sympathy. He holds that common sense should be allowed to help us in the interpretation of Shakespeare's plays. He thinks "that Shakespeare, like other great authors, probably said what he meant and meant what he said." Shakespeare is best regarded as a sixteenth century dramatist the most obvious interpretation of whom is the simplest and to be preferred to all others. He has "tried to approach [the dramas] in the historical spirit, and . . . to understand them as they are, without assuming them to be unintelligible, and without devising plans for their improvement." Surely this is the point of view we need for the fullest understanding of the plays.

The first of his essays and the one which gives the volume its title is on Hamlet. For various reasons none of the theories hitherto propounded in explanation of the Hamlet mystery can be regarded as wholly satisfactory. There is the view of Goethe and Coleridge that Hamlet was the victim of procrastination, owing to irresoluteness of character. This tendency to procrastination has been explained by Professor Bradley and others as due to the fact that Hamlet was the victim of melancholia. The trouble with such a view is that it takes one of the most vitally human of Shakespeare's characters into the field of pathology. Shakespeare was assuredly not writing a tragedy about a sick man; and as critics like Lewis have pointed out, audiences do not condemn Hamlet as a weakling or an invalid. Again, Klein and Werder, repudiating the notion of Hamlet's inherent incapacity for action, regard his delay as inevitable in view of the necessity of getting evidence to corroborate the story of the ghost, and of securing justice in such a way that it shall not seem to the people to be merely regicide. This view, as Mr. Crawford says, may be regarded as satisfactory so far as it goes. What Crawford now does is to take the further step and thus to round out a theory which does not fail to meet at most points the objections of critics. According to him, Hamlet is "a patriot and hero of a new type, who aims only to do what is for the good of his country. . . . His very inaction, wrongly called procrastination, assumes the character of the highest self-restraint and patriotism. His one fault is that he cannot always completely restrain himself in the face of such terrible provocation."¹³

Views equally sensible are presented in the other three essays. The Merchant of Venice is found to be not the tragedy of a Shy-

¹² Three typographical errors have been noted: p. 157, l. 20, read *sumum*; p. 252, l. 10 f.b., read who; p. 272, n. 1, l. 2, read mad, and Shakespear.

¹³ This is certainly the view of the author of *The Hystorie of Hamblet*, and also, one might contend, of the author of *Fratricide Punished*.

lock more sinned against than sinning, but rather a struggle between Jewish and Elizabethan Christian ideals of life (Justice vs. Mercy). Othello is the tragedy not of intrigue but of an incongruous marriage between a wilful, indiscreet, romantic white girl and a black whose pride had been outraged. Lear is a tragedy of despotism. Absolute rule had had its moral effect on the character of the old king. "In acquiring unlimited sovereignty over his dominion and over his family, he had completely lost sovereignty over himself." The tragedy of his experience illustrates the working out of moral justice. Again the dramatist "shows a sublime faith in the moral order, and in its certainty to bring ultimate triumph to right." Whether we accept these views or not, we cannot deny that they are intelligible and defensible on the grounds of common sense. The author pays a sincere tribute to the dramatist when he says that "the centuries of criticism have veered hither and thither in their judgments, but now show a tendency to come back to Shakespeare, and to accept whatever is manifestly the opinion of the dramatist."

To the valuable Shakespeare number of *Edda* Professor W. B. Cairns of the University of Wisconsin contributes a comprehensive sketch of the vogue of Shakespeare in America, discussing first, briefly, the editions,¹⁴ secondly, the study of Shakespeare in American schools, and thirdly, the acting of Shakespeare on the American stage. He concludes with some notes on the American celebrations of 1864 and on those which were about to be held in 1916. From his remarks and from the studies we have discussed above we get the impression that America, while she has made no startlingly brilliant contribution to Shakespearean scholarship, and while we ought to be thoroughly ashamed of her share in the Baconian controversy, has nevertheless figured respectably in the study and the acting of the great plays; and that our present interest in these activities, intellectual and artistic, gives promise for the future.

CLARK S. NORTHUP.

WILLIAM HAUGHTON'S "ENGLISHMEN FOR MY MONEY, OR A WOMAN WILL HAVE HER WILL."

Edited, with Introduction and Notes, by Albert Croll Baugh. Philadelphia, 1917. 8vo, pp. 224.

In spite of its title this doctoral dissertation is much more than a mere edition of William Haughton's *Englishmen for My Money*; it is a thorough study of an early Elizabethan playwright, who, though unimportant for his extant work, was in his day a conspicuous figure in the dramatic world, and a collaborator with

¹⁴ A curious misprint is found on p. 192; the editor of the Variorum was not Henry but Horace Howard Furness.